

Mr. Fuller - 2

social. From this I immediately knew either Gavzer's competence or your intent, or both. Few others who went closer to the Archives I also knew your intent. It was never more evident than he was out to "get" us. That he could write such a product of all this late in nothing but lies, misrepresentations, accusations and disinformation and do me credit the intelligence of a press agency.

July 1, 1967

Mr. Keith Fuller
Assistant General Manager
The Associated Press

50 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10020

Dear Mr. Fuller:

In my letter in response to the libelous series of AP articles about me, I charged plagiarism, lying, distortion, misrepresentation and misquotation. Your answer is a mild expression of childish evasiveness: You are not surprised that I do not agree with your "lengthy look at the Warren Report versus its critics". The only thing that surprises me is your willingness to be a liar yourself.

You looked at neither. You converted yourself into the government's lackey. You dishonored yourself, which concerns me little, and the once-honorable press, which concerns me much.

No man charges me as I do you without response from me. I challenge you and you hide, you do not respond. To the evil intent of the Associated Press, which your letter affirms, you now add cowardice. Imagine the mighty AP afraid of an unimportant, single man like me and of the fact of its evil!

I am prepared to answer this lickspittle of yours on the basis of fact; you are not. I am prepared to show that you did exactly that of which I accuse you. You cannot defend your accusations against me or mine against you. To the degree that I can bring it about, I will bring this to public attention.

You further err in saying you are not surprised that I am not "enthralled by the effort". The truth is that I am, although I suggest it is an understatement. For me to consider that the mighty, wealthy AP assigned two of its by-line luminaries to such a lengthy, expensive "inquiry", and that in all that time they came up with not a single important news story, and that as a consequence of all this investment of your members' money you could not come up with either a story of consequence in support of the Commission or a viable attack on its critics boggles the mind. It is not that your men did not have access to sensational stories that exist. It is that their incompetence or bias is such they did not see them or would not use them.

One day I was at the Archives when Gavzer was at lunch. He had a file that had been secret. I thumbed through it and found what I would have supposed an honest news service and an honest and competent reporter would have thought important and newsworthy. The Associated Press has not moved this story. At the appropriate time I

shall. From this I immediately knew either Gavzer's competence or your intent, or both. From others who met Gavzer at the Archives, I also knew your intent. It was never any secret that he was out to "get" us. That he could not, that the end product of all this labor is nothing but lies, misrepresentations, misquotations and distortions that do not credit the intelligence of a pre-puberty child is its own kind of affirmation of the integrity and viability of my work. For this I am in your debt.

I am also in your debt for this resounding additional proof (not that it was still needed) that this awful thing that has happened to us was possible only because the press abdicated its once night-to-sacred responsibilities and made it possible.

To say, as you do in your last sentence, "From the reaction of the great bulk of the American press it seems unlikely that your low regard for the effort is shared," is to say one and/or both of two things: That the American press trusts you and you impose upon and abuse that trust; that they share with you a yearning to tend federal bedpans.

You looked at nothing. You converted yourself into the government's lackey. You disconcert yourself, which concerns me little, and the once-honorable press, which concerns me much.

No man dares me as I do you without response from me. I challenge you and you hide, you do not respond. To the evil intent of the Associated Press, which your letter ~~serves~~ now add cover-ups. **Harold Weisberg**, single man like me and of the fact of its evil!

I am prepared to answer this leesapittle of yours on the basis of fact; you are not. I am prepared to show that you did exactly that of which I accuse you. You cannot defend your accusations against me or mine against you. To the degree that I can bring it about, I will bring this to public attention.

You further err in saying you are not surprised that I am not "enthralled by the effort". The truth is that I am, although I suggest it is an understatement. For me to consider that the mighty, wealthy AP assigned two of its by-line luminaries to such a lengthy, expensive "inquiry", and that in all that time they came up with not a single important news story, and that as a consequence of all this investment of your members' money you could not come up with either a story of consequence in support of the Commission or a viable attack on the critics boggles the mind. It is not that your men did not have access to sensational stories that exist. It is that their incompetence or bias is such they did not see them or would not use them.

One day I was at the Archives when Gavzer was at lunch. He had a file that had been secret. I thumbed through it and found what I would have supposed an honest news service and an honest and competent reporter would have thought important and newsworthy. The Associated Press has not moved this story. At the appropriate time I